

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 17-19 and 21-57 are pending. Claims 1-16 and 20 have been canceled, claims 21-57 have been added, and claims 17-19 have been amended by way of the present amendment.

Claims 1 and 3-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Okada (US 2002/0046328) in view of Okada (US 6,181,870). Applicants respectfully traverse this art grounds of rejection.

Claims 1 and 3-16 have been canceled, rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

As to independent claim 17, neither the Okada '328 document nor the Okada '870 patent disclose or suggest the first, second and third navigation units recited in claim 17. Nor has the Examiner established a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to these recited features. The Examiner only makes a conclusory statement on page 5 of the August 11, 2005 Office Action that the combination of the Okada '328 document and the Okada '870 patent renders these features obvious. The Examiner has not pointed out with any particularity where these features can be found in either document.

The Okada '870 appears to come closest to even disclosing navigation units. For example, in Fig. 71, the Okada '870 patent teaches PGCI information including cells. However, the claimed first, second and third navigation units

recited in claim 17 do not read on this data structure. For example, Fig. 71 of Okada '870 does not show "at least one second navigation unit referencing more than one third navigation unit." The Okada '328 document also provides no teaching or suggestion of this feature. Accordingly, Okada '328 in view of Okada '870 can not render claim 17 obvious to one skilled in the art.

Independent claims 26, 34, 42, and 50 include similar limitations to those discussed above with respect to claim 17, and are patentable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 17.

The remaining claims are dependent on one of the above-discussed independent claims, and are patentable at least for the reasons stated above with respect to the independent claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of above remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding rejection and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.


If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit

Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16
or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC

By 
Gary D. Yacura
Reg. No. 35,416

GDY:jcp

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 668-8000